



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,385	02/23/2004	Daniel Seguin	MOSA-09	8425
26875 7590 03/18/2008 WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
EXAMINER				
DUNWOODY, AARON M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3679				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,385

Applicant(s)

SEGUIN ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron M. Dunwoody

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/21/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 4257268, Pepicelli et al in view of US patent 6117394, Smith.

In regards to claim 1, Pipicelli et al disclose a mounting fixture for connecting pipettes of various sizes to the air channel of a pipettor, the fixture comprising a tubular nose (240) having a proximate end secured to the pipettor and an open distal end; and a resilient retainer (242) lining the interior of the nose, the retainer having an axial passageway communicating at its entry and exit openings respectively with the open distal end of the nose and with the air channel of the pipettor, the passageway being tapered from a maximum diameter at the entry opening to a minimum diameter at the

exit opening, the entry opening being sized to axially receive the largest of the pipettes and the sleeve being internally configured to resiliently grip differently sized pipettes inserted therein at different locations along the length thereof. Pepicelli does not disclose a stabilizing member at the open distal end of the nose. Smith teaches a stabilizing member (Tp) at the open distal end of the nose (P) to limit the possibility of cross contamination between samples (col. 1, lines 8-13). As Smith relates to disposable tips for pipette devices, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a stabilizing member at the open distal end of the nose to limit the possibility of cross contamination between samples, as taught by Smith.

Note, the pipettes are not considered part of the claimed invention.

In regards to claim 2, Smith further discloses the stabilizing member comprising a tubular sleeve projecting axially from the distal end of the nose.

In regards to claim 3, Smith further discloses the stabilizing member being rigid, and being detachably secured to the distal end of the nose, and having an inner diameter smaller than that of the entry opening of the resilient retainer.

In regards to claim 4, Smith further discloses the stabilizing member being snap fitted into the open distal end of the tubular nose.

In regards to claim 5, Pepicelli et al in view of Smith disclose the claimed invention except for the stabilizing member projecting axially from the distal end of the nose by a distance at least about 0.5 times the minimum diameter of the axial passageway in the resilient retainer. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate the stabilizing member projecting axially from the distal end of the nose by a distance at least about 0.5 times the minimum diameter of the axial passageway in the resilient retainer, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Response to Arguments

From the onset, Examiner contends that US patent 4257268, Pepicelli et al in view of US patent 6117394, Smith met all the structure claim limitations, even if the functional limitations are not repeated in the rejection above.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the instant invention solves a different problem than cross-contamination, it has been held that the mere fact that the reference relied on by the Patent and Trademark Office fail to evince an appreciation of the problem identified and solved by applicant is not, standing alone, conclusive evidence of the nonobviousness of the claimed subject matter. The references may suggest doing what an applicant has done even though workers in the art were ignorant of the existence of the problem. *In re Gershon*, 152, USPQ 602 (CCPA 1967).

Applicant argues that the instant claims have been amended to incorporate the language of the preamble into the body of the claim so as to be entitled to patentable weight. The Examiner disagrees. Applicant has not amended instant claims to

incorporate the language of the preamble into the body of the claim so as to be entitled to patentable weight.

Applicant argues Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case. The Examiner disagrees. The current rejection establishes a *prima facie* case.

Further, the simple meaning of configure is:

Configure: to set up for operation especially in a particular way.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary copyright © 2005 by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated

Therefore, the Examiner is puzzle how the pipettes are positively claimed when the stabilizing member is *set up for operation in particular way* for pipettes.

Furthermore, MPEP 2143, Examples of basic Requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, recites:

Example 2:

The claimed invention in *Leapfrog Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc.*, 435 F.3d 1157, 82 USPQ2d 1687 (Fed. Cir. 2007) was directed to a learning device to help young children read phonetically. The claim read as follows

An interactive learning device, comprising
a housing including a plurality of switches,
a sound production device in communication with the switches and including a processor and a memory,
at least one depiction of a sequence of letters, each letter being associable with a switch, and
a reader configured to communicate the identity of the depiction to the processor,
wherein selection of a depicted letter activates an associated switch to communicate with the processor, causing the sound production device to generate a signal corresponding to a sound associated with the selected letter, the sound being determined by a position of the letter in the sequence of letter.

The court concluded that the claimed invention would have been obvious in view of the combination of two pieces of prior art, (1) Bevan (which showed an electro-mechanical toy for phonetic learning), (2) the Super Speak & Read device (SSR) (an electronic reading toy), and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The court made clear that there was no technological advance beyond the skill shown in the SSR device. The court stated that "one of ordinary skill in the art of children's learning toys would have found it obvious to combine the Bevan device with the SSR to update it using modern electronic components in order to gain the commonly understood benefits of such adaptation, such as decreased size, increased reliability, simplified operation, and reduced cost. While the SSR only permits generation of a sound corresponding to the first letter of a word, it does so using electronic means. The combination is thus the adaptation of an old idea or invention (Bevan) using newer technology that is commonly available and understood in the art (the SSR)."

The court found that the claimed invention was but a variation on already known children's toys. This variation presented no nonobvious advance over other toys. The court made clear that there was no technological advance beyond the skill shown in the SSR device. The court found that "[a]ccommodating a prior art mechanical device that accomplishes that goal to modern electronics would have been reasonably obvious to one of ordinary skill in designing children's learning devices. Applying modern electronics to older mechanical devices has been commonplace in recent years."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron M. Dunwoody whose telephone number is 571-272-7080. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron M Dunwoody/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3679